

Tiered Licensure Technical Advisory Committee November 25, 2013

Attending: Andy Grover, Barb Leeds, Becky Meyer (via video conferencing), Lisa Burtenshaw (via video conferencing), Mikki Nuckols, Paula Kellerer, Penni Cyr, Rod Gramer, Shawn Tiegs (via conference call), Tracie Bent, Senator Roy Lacey, Don Soltman (via video conferencing), and Representative Hy Kloc.

Roger Quarles began the meeting by welcoming new ex-officio members to the committee—State Representative Hy Kloc, State Senator Roy Lacey, and State Board of Education Member Don Soltman. He also congratulated Lisa Burtenshaw on her recent election as Idaho School Boards Association President-Elect.

Dr. Quarles then outlined the agenda for the day—hearing from representatives of three states that are recognized as leaders in the implementation of tiered licensure. He asked the group to use the essential questions they drafted last month to ask questions of these states so the committee can use their ideas and lessons learned to create a system that best meets the needs of Idaho's students and teachers.

Christina Linder told the group that in selecting the states to present to the committee, staff asked whether the states had independent evaluation data of their tiered licensure systems. Most of the states have very new systems that have been implemented with Race to the Top funding, so they're just beginning to evaluate their programs. The only state that has been doing tiered licensure for a significant amount of time is New Mexico, and they had a scheduling conflict, but could present to the committee in the future.

North Carolina

Rachel McBroom, Director of Educator Preparation for the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, was the first presenter. She walked the group through an overview document of North Carolina's tiered licensure. (Document accessible at <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/tieredLicensure/docs/North%20Carolina%20Tiered%20Licensure%20Overview.pdf>.)

North Carolina transitioned to a tiered licensure system, because they recognized that their beginning teachers needed more support in order to be successful in the profession. A one-tiered system, where they were treated the same as a veteran teacher, wasn't helping those new teachers be successful.

There are two tiers in North Carolina's licensure system. The first is a Standard Professional 1 License (SP1), also known as an Initial Teaching License. It's valid for three years and allows a teacher to begin practicing on an independent basis. Teachers who graduate from an in-state, approved teacher education program are recommended by the college or university and issued an SP1.

The second tier is a Standard Professional 2 License (SP2), also known as a Continuing License. The license is on a five-year renewal cycle and allows teacher to serve on an on-going basis. To keep the license up to date, teachers must meet the continuing education requirements.

North Carolina has a significant number of teachers come from out-of-state. Those who have less than three years of experience are issued a SP1 license based on reciprocity agreements with the state they're coming from. Those with more than three years of experience take one of two pathways. If they either meet North Carolina's testing requirements or they are National Board Certified, they are

granted a SP2 license. If they have not met North Carolina's testing requirements or aren't National Board Certified, they're issued a SP2 license after working in North Carolina for one year upon the recommendation of the employing school district.

In 2007, North Carolina developed the North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards. Prior to that, North Carolina had pre-service teaching standards and evaluation standards, but they weren't aligned to each other. In 2008, the North Carolina State Board of Education required all teacher education programs to align with the North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards.

They also created the North Carolina teacher rubric for evaluating teachers (accessible at <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/tieredLicensure/docs/North%20Carolina%20Teacher%20Evaluation%20Rubric.pdf>) and a pre-service teacher rubric (accessible at <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/tieredLicensure/docs/North%20Carolina%20Preservice%20Teacher%20Rubric.pdf>). The two rubrics mirror each other and align to the Professional Teaching Standards.

In order for a teacher preparation program to recommend a candidate for licensure, they must meet proficiency on each of the indicators of the standards on the pre-service rubric.

The teacher evaluation rubric continues the progression from the pre-service rubric, with slightly different ratings. Proficient on a pre-service rubric should fall between developing and proficient on the teacher evaluation rubric, with the exception of the technology indicator. The rubric holds pre-service teachers slightly more accountable in regards to technology, because they're coming out of pre-service with exposure to the latest and greatest in technology. Practicing teachers need professional development to stay up-to-date on emerging technology.

Paula Kellerer asked what kind of evidence North Carolina expects from the institution of higher education to demonstrate that their students are proficient on the rubric. Ms. McBroom responded that campuses had to submit six performance-based evidences that aligned with the rubric. Those evidences were then reviewed by peer reviewers across the state before recommendations were made to the State Board of Education to reauthorize those programs. The evidences aligned to the rubric, but not the specific standards. The evidences are broad and vary a bit from campus to campus. The evidences that are consistent from campus to campus are the transcript, exam score, and certification of teaching capacity. More information is available at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/ihe/remodeling/>.

Dr. Kellerer also asked whether campuses keep that information on campus and available for review. Ms. McBroom responded that they'd originally planned an annual, electronic review before there were funding cuts in 2008. Programs began implementation in the fall of 2010. A pilot began in 2012 where the state chose the two largest programs to sample and review, and then realized that the annual, electronic reviews are a larger undertaking than the state can currently afford. Campuses now collect that evidence with the understanding they can be requested during continuous program approval.

Ms. Linder asked whether the certification of teaching capacity form was common among all teacher preparation programs and what is being done to ensure inter-rater reliability. Ms. McBroom said support in this is an area of weakness for the state. There is a need to ensure greater inter-rater reliability across the state. Through Race to the Top, the state has hired state regional staff to provide support around the evaluation system to districts, colleges, and universities.

The first five standards in North Carolina refer to professional growth. The sixth standard is student achievement growth. In the future, North Carolina will tie student achievement growth back to teacher preparation.

Initially, the North Carolina State Board of Education chose to emphasize the importance of collaboration within a school building. The state used the Education Value-Added Assessment System (SAS EVAAS) model for student achievement growth. Initially the teacher's score was based 70% on the individual teacher's student performance and 30% on the school performance (to encourage collaboration). This past fall, after collecting and analyzing the data for the first time, about 10% of teachers who were doing well with their individual students got bumped up a level because of their school's performance score and 10% got bumped down a level. The State Board of Education didn't feel like that was acceptable, so they changed to 100% of the sixth standard rating being based on individual student achievement growth.

Dr. Kellerer asked what the process was for alternative certification routes, such as Teach for America and ABCTE. Ms. McBroom responded that there's separate State Board of Education policy that deals with alternative certification programs. They go through a separate review process, but the process must be based on the same professional teaching standards. They're given flexibility in who they recruit and how they train them, but they must also submit a proposal that demonstrates how their candidate meets proficiency on the standards, as well. They're not necessarily using the pre-service rubric, because they're already teaching while they're earning their credential and being evaluated by the school they're teaching in.

Barb Leeds asked whether every school district in the state uses the same evaluation rubric. Ms. McBroom responded that all 115 districts and charter schools use the evaluation instrument.

North Carolina also has a strong Beginning Teacher Support Program (BTSP). The work is funded through federal Title II funding. The state employs "teachers on loan" through the State Department of Education. They are situated regionally and provide focused support to beginning teachers in the districts in their region.

The state is required to provide beginning teachers a mentor, annual evaluations, and a professional development plan. Initially, only beginning teachers were evaluated annually, but after accepting Race to the Top funding, all teachers are now evaluated annually. Anyone on a SP1 license with less than three years of teaching experience is required to participate in the BTSP.

The BTSP works well, because the "teachers on loan" help in the auditing and monitoring of beginning teacher support plans.

North Carolina requires beginning teachers have a mentor, but the General Assembly cut the funding for the mentor stipends, so districts have had to get creative on how to recruit veteran teachers to become mentors. Many times there's not local or state funding available, but we've still managed to provide that mentor support to beginning teachers.

Each beginning teacher, in collaboration with their administrator and mentor, develops a professional development plan. The plan is based around the North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards and includes a self-assessment and goals and strategies for improvement. The plan is update annually.

Dr. Quarles asked whether the mentor participates in the classroom observation portion of the evaluation. Ms. McBroom said that beginning teachers must have a minimum of four observations in the first year. Three must be made by an administrator, and one must be made by a peer or mentor. While the mentor completes one of the observations, they are not formally involved in the summary rating evaluation at the end of the year.

Penni Cyr asked whether North Carolina continues the use of peers in evaluations as a teacher progresses through licensure. Ms. McBroom answered it's not required, but it's an option.

Dr. Kellerer asked whether administrators are held accountable to demonstrate their capacity to effectively use the evaluation tool. Ms. McBroom answered in the affirmative. North Carolina contracted with McREL to develop an online database and provide training statewide. Responsibility was pushed to human resource directors in districts to hold their administrators accountable. Ms. McBroom said this is an area of weakness that needs improved upon. Through Race to the Top, North Carolina is looking at state-initiated trainings to ensure consistency with human resource directors to take back training to their district administrators.

In order to convert from a SP1 to a SP2 license, a teacher must have three years of satisfactory teaching experience. "Satisfactory" is determined by the teacher in the third year receiving a minimum rating of proficient on all five of the professional teaching standards. They must also have been recommended by their employing school system, completed all professional development requirements of the school district, and met any testing requirements for their area of certification. It's up to each school district to confirm the eligibility of each teacher's license conversion. If they meet the requirements, the district simply checks off, and the teacher gets the license conversion. If the district doesn't check off, the state doesn't grant the license.

Ms. Linder asked if, at the end of three year, the teacher isn't proficient in all areas, do they get another SP1 license? Is there a limit to how long they can remain in SP1? Ms. McBroom explained there are two options under North Carolina's due process. First, the teacher can appeal. Second, as long as it's not an ethical issue, the teacher can go back to an approved teacher preparation program and re-affiliate. The campus will develop a program of study to address the teacher's areas of deficiency. Upon completion, the university can recommend the candidate for another SP1 license. The teacher would have to go through the BTSP a second time. There's not a limit to how many times they can do this. To our knowledge, no one has done this for a third time. After six years not being able to convert, most people walk away from the profession.

Ms. Linder then asked how many teachers have left the profession after not converting. Ms. McBroom said she didn't have that data readily available.

Ms. Linder also asked if a teacher re-affiliates with the university and goes back through the program, can the university deny them a recommendation. Ms. McBroom responded that it's up to the university. If the university recommends them, the state's expectation is that they can provide similar data and evidences that they would for anyone else in the program. Universities often elect to make them go back and demonstrate proficiency on the evidences again. The state stays out of it, because they want campuses to have the flexibility to individualize a program of study based on a candidates' area of deficiency.

Rod Gramer asked how compensation is tied to evaluations and licensure. Right now in North Carolina, compensation is not tied to licensure. The state has a salary schedule based on years of experience and degrees earned. The General Assembly recently decided to eliminate teacher tenure, so the compensation system is up for debate at the moment. Ms. McBroom sees the potential of North Carolina moving to tying compensation to these areas of licensure.

Dr. Kellerer asked whether a national standards framework was used in the development of the state's teaching standards. Ms. McBroom responded that North Carolina looked at their previous standards, which were aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and relied heavily on the Framework for 21st Century Skills. Beyond that, they didn't look at other national frameworks.

Dr. Kellerer then asked how the mentoring teacher standards were developed. Educators on loan worked with BTSP staff across the state to look at the research. There wasn't a particular framework, but they modeled their standards against the five professional teaching standards.

Dr. Kellerer asked whether there was a common template for the BTSP plans or whether districts develop their own. Ms. McBroom said there's a common template.

Ms. Leeds asked what a district does regarding a teacher's contract if the teacher doesn't move from SP1 to SP2. Is there an obligation to keep them contracted when they go back to train? Ms. McBroom said there's no obligation to keep them contracted. If a teacher doesn't convert, the contract is over, and there's no obligation to bring them back.

Mr. Gramer asked what the state does to support veteran teachers in moving from accomplished to distinguished. Ms. McBroom said the sixth standard (student achievement scores) helps them focus the conversation with administrators who do the evaluation system and use it as a check and balance. They suspected inflation of teacher evaluation ratings. Through Race to the Top, North Carolina provided significant amounts of training on evaluation ratings. Now the state has moved into the second phase, which is preparing administrators to be better coaches of veteran teachers. Strategies to move from proficient to accomplished or accomplished to distinguished should be included as part of a veteran teacher's end of year summary evaluation.

Mr. Gramer then asked if any special consideration was given to teachers who are specialists on their evaluations. Ms. McBroom responded that the only differentiation that is provided on evaluations is for SP2 licenses. In the fifth year, they are required to have a complete observation on all five standards. In years 1 and 3 of the SP2 license, administrators have the option of doing an abbreviated evaluation, where they're only evaluated on standards 1, 4, and 6.

Through SAAS, North Carolina can differentiate what percentage of student achievement would go to a specialist based on the time they spent with that student.

Ms. Cyr asked whether there was a tiered licensure system for administrators in the state. Ms. McBroom said to get an administrator's license you must hold a teacher license first. Beyond that, there's just one level of administrative license. Ms. McBroom said an administrator tiered licensure would help their state move forward, because they're seeing the critical importance of effective administrators. Administrator preparation programs went through a similar process as teacher preparation programs to align teaching standards between preparation and practice.

Ms. Cyr also asked whether SP2 was the highest level in the system. Ms. McBroom said it was the highest level and doesn't have anything to do with education level (master's degree, etc.).

Dr. Kellerer asked whether the state has considered adding additional teachers, what stakeholders were involved in the development of the system, and how everyone was kept informed. Ms. McBroom said the state is currently considering adding more tiers, based on conversations with the General Assembly about compensation.

The work around the development of the standards was started by the Professional Teaching Standards Commission. The executive director of the commission worked with stakeholders to identify members of the commission, including Teachers of the Year, human resource directors, institution of higher education, and the state association of educators. Drafts of the standards were distributed statewide through various meetings.

Dr. Kellerer then asked whether parents and the business community had an opportunity to give feedback during the development of the system. Ms. McBroom wasn't involved at the state department of education at that time, so she wasn't aware of the role parents and the business community played.

Dr. Quarles asked why Ms. McBroom thought Idaho should also move towards a tiered licensure system and what difference the system has made in North Carolina for teachers and students. Ms. McBroom said she likes the tiered licensure system, because it helps beginning teacher become more effective. She also feels more confident as a parent knowing that teachers can't stay in the classroom as long as they want if they're not effective.

North Carolina is also looking at issuing an effectiveness status on teachers based on their rating on professional standards one through five and a three year average of their standard six data. They're in the first year of a three year cycle, so no one has an effectiveness status, yet. There are already conversations that conversion from SP1 to SP2 may be based on effectiveness status in the future, which would require making the SP1 license a four year license, to give time for the data to come back.

Dr. Quarles asked if the standard six data will be reported publicly. Ms. McBroom said the data will be reported on the state's website; however, it will be aggregated by school, district, and college/university, because the individual data is protected by personnel laws in North Carolina.

Dr. Quarles then asked what evidence is collected for student achievement. Is it based on one test or multiple measures of student achievement? North Carolina uses SAS's EVAAS model based on standardized assessment at the end of the year. Race to the Top funding was used to develop common final exams in subjects like world history where a statewide standardized assessment didn't exist.

Lisa Burtenshaw asked if teachers kept their license when they re-affiliated with a teacher preparation program. Ms. McBroom responded that a SP1 license expires when a teacher doesn't convert to a SP2 license. It typically takes a year for a teacher to go back through that teacher preparation program.

Shawn Tiegs asked what the process is for a teacher with a SP2 license who doesn't qualify for renewal of their license. Ms. McBroom said the state doesn't require them to go back to a college or university to re-affiliate. If there was an ethical violation, the teacher would have to appeal to the State Board of

Education to have the license renewed. Otherwise, the teacher would have to provide documentation they had met the continuing education requirements.

Dr. Quarles asked what statutory requirements North Carolina had around due process prior to tiered licensure. Ms. McBroom said licensure was based solely upon whether you'd met the continuing education requirements. It was then up to the district whether the teacher's effectiveness warranted breaking the contract and letting the teacher go. Hiring and firing is handled by the districts. North Carolina is trying to create stronger state guidelines on when to let a teacher go. Dr. Quarles followed up by asking whether the Professional Teaching Standards Commission is addressing the issue. Ms. McBroom said that commission was disbanded by the General Assembly, so the State Board of Education and State Department of Education are taking up the work.

To clarify, Ms. Cyr said her understanding was that once a teacher in North Carolina has a SP2 license, they have to meet proficiency in the teaching standards to continue to receive a license. However, if a teacher isn't performing at the district, it's up to the district to put the teacher on a plan of improvement. If the teacher doesn't succeed, the district lets them go, but they don't take away their license. Ms. McBroom confirmed this was correct. Licensure and employment are separate. However, that's subject to change as North Carolina fleshes out their evaluation system and the inclusion of student achievement.

Dr. Quarles thanked Ms. McBroom for her time, preparation, and assistance.

The group then began a committee discussion on what they'd heard from North Carolina. Ms. Linder remarked that there are many infrastructure pieces to a tiered licensure system already in place in Idaho—alignment of pre-service and in-service, the Danielson Framework for teacher evaluations, a single summative assessment in teacher preparation programs, administrator evaluation, mentor teacher standards, teacher leader standards, and a teacher leader endorsement.

Mr. Tiegs commented that the committee will have to think about how teachers with multiple endorsements will be placed on the tiered system. What do you do with an outstanding teacher in math, who also has another content endorsement but may not be as excellent in that area?

Dr. Quarles said he'd wished he'd asked North Carolina how long it took to develop their system. He'd also like to statistically evaluate Idaho's plan, specifically recruitment efforts, retention efforts, student learning, and efficiencies in resources. Ms. Linder pointed out that as part of the Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP) grant, Idaho has committed to evaluating efforts in this area.

Mr. Gramer asked if any states have gone back and looked at their data. Ms. Linder said New Mexico is the only state she knows of with any kind of extensive data. Other tiered licensure systems haven't been in place long enough to have the data.

The group then took a fifteen minute break.

Ohio

After the break, the committee heard a presentation from Julia Simmerer, Director of the Office of Educator Effectiveness for the Ohio Department of Education. Ms. Simmerer led the group through an overview document of Ohio's licensure program. (Document accessible at <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/tieredLicensure/>) Ohio passed legislation to begin their tiered licensure

system in 2009. The four tiers were developed in 2010, and licenses began being issued in 2011. Previously Ohio had a two-tiered licensure system: initial and professional. The four-tiers currently in Ohio are:

1. Initial/Resident Educator- 4 year, non-renewable license.
2. Professional- 5 year, renewable license. Teachers can stay at professional licensure for the remainder of their careers, if they choose.
3. Senior Professional- 5 year, renewable license. Teachers must have at least a master's degree, nine years teaching experience, and have completed the Master Teacher Portfolio.
4. Lead Professional Educator License- 5 year, renewable license. Teachers don't have to go through Senior Professional to become a Leader Professional. They must have at least a master's degree, nine years teaching experience, and either have earned a Teacher Leader endorsement and completed a Master Teacher Portfolio or be Nationally Board Certified.

Ohio Resident Educator Program- Ohio used to be a Praxis III state, so they've always had year-end summative assessments in place. Ohio is in year three of the first four year licenses, so teachers are just now eligible to take the Resident Educator Summative Assessment. The assessment is videotaped and the teacher reflects on communication, collaboration, and formative/summative assessment. Resident educators can attempt the assessment in year three and must complete by year four.

The video conference call with Ms. Simmerer was then dropped and there was a pause in the meeting.

When the video conference call was reconnected, Ms. Simmerer explained that in order for teachers to advance from a resident educator license to a professional license, teachers must have four years teaching experience, four years support/mentoring, and have passed all five tasks on the Resident Educator Summative Assessment.

Since Ohio started issuing licenses on July 1, 2011, they've issued almost 28,000 resident educator licenses. Many of these are graduates of Ohio colleges and universities, but not employed by Ohio schools. Ohio has issued 874 senior professional licenses and 807 lead professional licenses. The professional educator license existed before the four-tiered system, so that number is much larger than the rest. There are approximately 130,000 teachers in Ohio.

In the 2011-2012 school year, there were 4,105 resident educators and 3,008 mentors in the Ohio Resident Educator Program. In the 2012-2013 school year, there were 9,133 resident educators and 5,566 mentors in the program. In the 2013-2014 school year to date, there are 14,768 resident educators in the program.

Dr. Kellerer asked if it was correct that a teacher couldn't move into a senior or lead license until they'd had nine years teaching experience. Ms. Simmerer said that was correct. When they developed these licenses, they wanted teachers to have completed the resident educator program (four years) and a complete professional cycle (five years), so that's where the nine year requirement came from. However, they didn't want to wait nine years from initiation in 2011 to start awarding those licenses, so they required nine years prior experience.

Dr. Kellerer then asked for the link to the Master Teacher Portfolio rubric. Ms. Simmerer said it's posted on the Ohio Department of Education website under the keyword search "master teacher."

This is Ohio's first year administering the Resident Educator Summative Assessment, and there are 328 teachers registered to take the assessment. It's been developed over the last two years with Stanford University and Teachscape. Teachscape is the platform for teachers to log on and submit their written commentary, evidence, and videos.

EdTPA is a performance assessment that many colleges and universities are looking at to decide whether it's a program graduation requirement or a licensure requirement. In Ohio, they foresee moving to it as a licensure requirement. Most universities in Ohio have it as a program completion requirement.

The Resident Educator Summative Assessment has five tasks. Tasks 1 and 3 are video-taped portions of a lesson with written commentary to support the decisions they were making. Task 2 is around formative and summative assessment. They track three students, look at work samples, and show their decision making based on formative and summative assessment. Task 4 asks the candidate to demonstrate their knowledge with communication and collaboration. They provide communications to parents and stakeholders and then evaluate if the communication was received in the way it was intended. Task 5 is a student survey being developed with Cambridge. The survey itself is not scored, but the reflection on the survey is scored. It's a completion score and required in order to advance. Early childhood students can't respond to a written survey, so in those instances another colleague observes student interactions and provides notes on how students are receiving communications from the teacher, then the teacher reflects on those notes. The Resident Educator Summative Assessment Handbook is available at www.ohioresa.com. Each task has a time window it must be completed in. The first window opened November 11th. The first video is due December 15th. The last task is due May 15th. Teachers will receive their scores by the end of August and know whether they can bank their scores or if they have to redo the assessment.

Ms. Linder asked what happens at the end of year four if a teacher hasn't passed all parts of the Resident Educator Summative Assessment and who scores the assessment. Ms. Simmerer responded that if they're not successful at the end of year four, they can have a one year extension. Right now, Ohio allows three attempts, but there's no hard and fast policy.

Teachscape has put out an application for Ohio educators to score the Resident Educator Summative Assessment. The assessments are uploaded electronically, and then evaluators can score the assessments at home on their own time frame. There will be 16,000 tasks to score. 800 educators have applied, but an invitation will be extended for more. Evaluators will go through an online training to be certified. Random pools of assessments will be double scored to make sure scoring is valid and reliable.

Ms. Linder asked whether teachers doing the scoring will be compensated and what the cost is for the resident educator to take the summative assessment. Ms. Simmerer said there's no cost to the district or teachers. The development of the summative assessment was funded by Race the Top. If you asked districts, they would say the cost for them comes from mentoring. The state used to pay a stipend for mentoring. When the state ended Praxis III, they also ended the funding for mentoring.

Teachers scoring Task 1 and 3 are paid \$30 for each assessment scored. Task 2 pays \$35. Task 4 pays approximately \$25. Task 5 only pays \$2, because teachers can score them quickly. The scorer must go through approximately 30 hours of training that costs approximately \$10 per hour.

Ms. Burtenshaw asked whether mentor teachers have to come from a certain level of licensure. Ms. Simmerer said the state envisioned them coming from a senior or lead licensure, but there aren't large enough numbers in those licenses yet, so right now they just have to hold a professional license.

Some of the possibilities and areas where Ohio could go next with a tiered licensure system are differentiated compensation based on licensing and connecting evaluations to licensing.

Mr. Gramer asked whether student performance is included in evaluations. Ms. Simmerer responded that for teacher evaluations it's 50% teacher performance and 50% student growth. If a teacher is in a content area with a value added score, it must be part of the 50% student growth. Other options include vendor assessments and student learning objectives. Currently, student growth is only used for evaluation purposes, not compensation, although it will likely come.

Ms. Cyr asked how alternative licensure fits into the Ohio tiered licensure system. Ms. Simmerer said Ohio has an Alternative Resident Educator license, which requires a bachelor's degree, major in the subject to be taught (or extensive work experience), completion of an Intensive Pedagogical Training Institute, and content area examination. Mentoring and the Resident Educator Program begin immediately. Those educators usually wait until year four to do the Resident Educator Summative Assessment.

Mr. Gramer asked what the state's rationale or purpose was for moving to tiered licensure. Ms. Simmerer said it was geared around retaining the best teachers and differentiation of roles. Once those were established, the intent was to move to higher levels of compensation for those individuals.

Dr. Quarles asked how much of the Race to the Top grant the state has used to get to this point (total cost). Ms. Simmerer said the teacher evaluation was the main cost. She guessed they'd spent \$10-12 million out of the four-year grant to make sure they were developing the system correctly.

Andy Grover asked if tiered licensure made it harder to attract teachers to already hard-to-fill positions. Ms. Simmerer said tiered licensure made it easier for teachers to receive support. Ohio has 51 teacher preparation programs and produces more teachers than they can employ, but they still have hard-to-staff in special education, STEM, and foreign language. A candidate knowing they'll receive four years of support has helped Ohio attract good candidates to the state.

Dr. Quarles asked if tiered licensure was helping to keep highly effective teachers in the classroom. Ms. Simmerer said they don't have data to show that yet, but they hope it is. If you asked districts, she believes they would say yes. Tiered licensure provides recognition.

Dr. Quarles then asked what the two biggest concerns she's had to deal with at the state-level. Ms. Simmerer said the first struggle is that districts feel they need to provide one-to-one mentoring for all three years, instead of differentiating the mentoring across the years. Districts will also tell you the funding for mentors has become a hardship. The second struggle was communication around the summative assessment. There's still high anxiety around the assessment and the online nature.

Dr. Kellerer asked if there was any level of assurance of mentoring quality and whether the state checks the master teacher portfolios to confirm reliability of scoring. Ms. Simmerer said Ohio requires two, one-day trainings of every mentor. The trainings were developed by the New Teacher Center in California. There are also optional regional trainings. There are mentor standards online, program

evaluations, and program coordinators, as well. Regarding the master teacher portfolio, training is offered around scoring; however, there isn't a compliance office to randomly check.

Dr. Quarles asked who was involved in the development of tiered licensure. Ms. Simmerer said Ohio has an educator standards board, which all licensure requirements go through. They developed the requirements for tiered licensure, within the confines of the law. It's 21 members—11 teachers, 5 administrators, a school business manager, members of higher education, a school board representative, and a parent representative.

Dr. Quarles asked if additional staff was added to the state department of education to implement tiered licensure. Ms. Simmerer said the state added a person to coordinate mentors and training in the Resident Educator Program.

Dr. Quarles and Ms. Linder thanked Ms. Simmerer for joining the committee to discuss Ohio's licensure system.

The group then began a committee discussion on what they'd heard from North Carolina. Dr. Quarles commented that neither state they'd heard from that day started tiered licensure with the intention of tying it to a compensation system. Senator Lacey commented that they might not have started that way, but both states are now talking about tying compensation to tiered licensure. He suggested the committee look at this upfront, instead of later.

Ms. Cyr said the number of hours and people needed to score the Resident Educator Summative Assessment were large and hard to imagine working in Idaho.

Mr. Gramer noted that mentoring was very successful in both models, and although it was successful funding was still cut. Ms. Linder commented that a New Teacher Center report shows that money spent on mentoring programs is saved in retaining teachers.

The committee then took a break for lunch until 1:45 pm/MT.

Maryland

After lunch, the committee heard a presentation from Jean Satterfield, Assistant State Superintendent over Educator Effectiveness for the Maryland Department of Education, and Joann Ericson, Chief of the Certification Branch at the Maryland Department of Education. Ms. Satterfield began by explaining Maryland has always had a Professional Eligibility Certificate (PEC). They then added Standard Professional I and II certificates (SPC I and SPCII) and an Advance Professional Certificate. There's also a conditional license for teachers working on requirements to be endorsed in another content area. There's also a Resident Teacher Certificate for districts who hire someone to teach a specialized program.

Dr. Ericson told the group some form of tiered licensure has been in place in Maryland for more than twenty years. Certificate validity periods have changed, but there's always been an initial licensure phase and an advanced stage.

Maryland requires a professional learning plan and six professional learning credits within five years to renew a certificate. To get an Advanced Professional Certificate, an educator must have either 1) a master's degree, 2) 36 semester hours of post-baccalaureate course work (21 hours of which are

graduate level), or 3) National Board Certification and 12 graduate credits. The State Board tried to get rid of the master's degree requirement, and instead award Advanced Professional Certificates to teachers with highly effective ratings on their teacher evaluation for three out of four years. It didn't pass the Legislature.

Dr. Ericson added that Utah has a fairly defined statute on professional learning plans.

Ms. Satterfield said Maryland does not have a state salary schedule. In some school systems you get an additional raise in pay for having an advanced degree, because it's locally negotiated. Employment issues and negotiated items are kept separate from certification. Licensure is not tied to compensation.

Maryland requires 6 continuing professional development courses to renew certification.

Ms. Satterfield said Maryland tries not to use the term "grandfathering." Once you have an initial certificate, you can add additional endorsements. Certificates are valid for five years. All regulatory changes are instituted on the point of adoption forward. Employees are given time to meet the regulatory changes required. If a certificate lapses, you have to meet the new requirements of the certificate.

Ms. Leeds asked if an educator becomes unemployed whether they keep their SPC license or if they move back to a PEC license. Dr. Ericson responded that the certificate would remain valid for the five-year term. At the end of the renewal term, if the teacher is still unemployed, they would go back to a PEC. The PEC license indicates you've met all the requirements, but are not employed.

In Maryland, districts use different evaluation systems. When the state pursued Race to the Top funding, they passed a regulation requiring educators to rate "satisfactory" on an evaluation with four key components.

Maryland uses student learning objectives as their assessment of student growth. Student growth is not being used for personnel decisions this year, because their state is implementing the Common Core State Standards, and the statewide tests aren't yet aligned.

Mr. Gramer asked whether there was any data that this system has improved student performance or improved teacher retention. Ms. Satterfield responded that this is the first year the state will collect data on teachers. The state plans to look at where a teacher got their training to see how teachers from those programs do based on their students' achievement.

Dr. Quarles asked what amount of the Race to the Top grant has been spent on tiered licensure. Ms. Satterfield responded no money has been spent on tiered licensure, because they were doing that previously. However, they have used the funding to change their educator information system to make it more user-friendly and able to match student growth data.

Ms. Linder asked what evidence educators must submit when coming from out-of-state that they've exhibited satisfactory performance? There is a standardized form to fill out that goes to the human resource director or principal in the state that they previously worked in.

When Maryland first began a conversation about switching from certificates to credentials, they formed a work group that met for a year and a half. One of their recommendations was to eliminate the need

for a master's degree, because the research is mixed whether it leads to enhanced student achievement.

Maryland also has 244 professional learning development schools within their public schools for student-teachers. It helps them get hands on experience, even prior to their 100 day internship, with school improvement plans and teacher evaluations.

Mr. Gramer asked whether tiered licensure has anything to do with Maryland's high reading proficiency scores. Ms. Satterfield said licensing is a minimum standard—"do no harm." Dr. Ericson said the tiered licensure system doesn't necessarily contribute to student achievement.

Ms. Linder asked if Maryland has looked at a tiered licensure system for administrators. Ms. Satterfield responded that they have Administrator 1 and 2 licenses, but it's not a true tiered system.

Dr. Quarles thanked Ms. Satterfield and Dr. Ericson for sharing with the group.

The group then began a committee discussion on what they'd heard from Maryland. Ms. Burtenshaw commented that Maryland's system was less about tiers and more about routes, compared to other states the committee had heard from. Ms. Linder noted that the system was very input based. Ms. Keller commented that she was excited they have individualized professional learning plans, until she heard they were associated with six credits, because that's not connected with improving student achievement. Sen. Lacey was concerned that it may have been loosely put together and not evaluated.

Dr. Quarles then transitioned the group to talking about next steps. The committee will meet again on December 13th. He asked if they'd heard enough from other states to start developing our state's system, or if they'd like to hear from other states. The committee requested presentations from New Mexico and Washington at the next meeting.

Rep. Kloc asked what the parameters are that Idaho's system must be built within. Dr. Quarles said the preliminary research and framework that Ms. Linder presented to the Task Force for Improving Education was a three tiered system with a more rigorous nature for initial licensure. Tiered licensure would be a way to keep highly effective teachers who want to earn more in the classroom, rather than having to pursue an administrator license. His sense from the Task Force was that compensating teachers at a higher level would be tied to a tiered licensure system. Ms. Cyr commented that she didn't necessarily think compensation and tiered licensure had to be tied together based on the Task Force recommendations, although it's worth exploring. The recommendations were broad and need to be developed.

Ms. Linder added that the NTEP grant includes a draft of a reasonable model moving forward. The state made the commitment to CCSSO to deeply explore tiered licensure and find benchmarks for entering into the profession.

Tracie Bent confirmed that the tiered licensure recommendation from the Task Force was a framework, and the expectation was that the details would be filled in.

Dr. Quarles then transitioned the group to a presentation on the NTEP grant timeline and goals. Ms. Linder told the group that the main goal of the grant by October 2015 was that, "Tiered performance-based licensure for all educators shall be established based upon Idaho's definition of 'Learner Ready

Teacher' (Three-tiered) and 'School Ready Principal' (Two-tiered) and aligned to a coherent developmental continuum." In the next six months, the grant says all stakeholders will be identified and fully informed of tiered licensure and the beginnings of a pilot will be taking place in pre-service across the state. Performance measures designed for pre-service candidates seeking initial licensure will mirror each other, and observations will be conducted using the same rubric across the continuum to ensure maximum growth.

Dr. Quarles asked the group if all the right stakeholders had been identified for the committee, understanding that he's still looking for a parent representative. There were no additional representative suggestions made.

Dr. Quarles then asked Dr. Kellerer to talk about the performance measures for pre-service candidates seeking initial licensure. Dr. Kellerer said all the colleges are piloting a common summative assessment. Students must score at least basic in all 22 components. The first data from those assessments will be back at the end of this semester, and then reliability will be checked between the colleges.

In addition, several institutions are piloting individual professional learning plans, which identify three key performance indicators that pre-service teachers would take with them into their first years of service. The individual learning plans are aligned with the Danielson Framework. It will help principals know which three key areas a teacher has identified to work on in their first years of teaching.

Ms. Linder added that different institutions will be piloting different measures. Some will use student surveys and some will use student learning objectives.

Dr. Quarles then asked the group to look at the list of Essential Questions and answer the question "What is your rationale for moving to a tiered licensure system," as well as three other questions off the list.

Mr. Gramer suggested whatever system is designed should drive student outcomes. There will be other benefits, like keeping great teachers and rewarding teachers, but all that points to the key focus—driving student performance.

Dr. Keller agreed with Mr. Gramer's remarks.

Ms. Burtenshaw added that in addition to considering how tiered licensure is tied to compensation, she'd like to consider how it's tied to hiring and firing. Ms. Cyr commented that licensure is a property right, but the job is not.

Ms. Leeds expressed concern about a tiered licensure system without financial incentive behind it.

Mr. Grover said after listening to three schools and their rationale, one thing he was disappointed in was that there's not data to back up the tiered licensing. He believes it's important to tie the elements of Idaho's system to research and measure the results.

Mr. Gramer expressed a desire to align licensure with evaluations and compensations and not have advancement on the tiers based just on experience or advanced degrees. He'd like to include student performance as part of advancement.

Rep. Kloc asked how many pilot programs are going on in teacher preparation programs. Ms. Linder responded that every teacher preparation program has put together at least two teams of three—a candidate, a collaborating teacher, and a university supervisor. Twenty-five groups of three are all part of the official pilot.

Rep. Kloc asked if the pilot will be done in a year. Ms. Linder responded that they'll evaluate and regroup this spring and then use a standardized protocol next year. The teams will be the same next year, with the exception of the candidate.

Rep. Kloc asked how that fit with the goals for implementation in the NTEP grant. Ms. Linder responded that at the end of the 2014-2015 school year they'll be able to say with some certainty which measures show which teachers are prepared and translate into advancing through the continuum.

Ms. Cyr added that she's really excited about the pre-service piece, making sure teachers are ready when they get to the classroom, and all the universities collaborating around the state. She believes there needs to be compensation for the different levels of the career ladder and opportunities for teachers to see how they can improve their practice and advance in their career while still staying in the classroom.

Ms. Nuckols agreed with Ms. Cyr's comment about the career ladder. Instead of talking about "licensure," she'd like to talk about "advancing in the career."

Rep. Kloc asked if an Idaho teacher becomes an administrator, do they get a pay increase. If so, do they keep the pay increase if they go back into the classroom? Dr. Quarles responded that it depends on the role they serve in the district, and it varies from district to district.

Dr. Quarles again asked the group to email their responses to the essential questions to Camille Wells.

Mr. Gramer asked if legislation would be brought forward during the 2014 Legislative Session. Dr. Quarles responded that there won't be. Ms. Linder said certification is always put in administrative rule, not statute. Ms. Cyr asked if recommendations would be made by April, since the pilots won't be over. Ms. Linder said it would be reasonable to think we could create a broad framework. Ms. Cyr said she wants the pilot to work. She doesn't want to put parameters around it that won't allow it to work.

Mr. Gramer asked why Superintendent Luna requested \$42 million for a career ladder in his FY2015 budget request. Dr. Quarles reminded the group that tiered licensure and a career ladder were separate recommendations, and Superintendent Luna tried to meet all the recommendations from the Task Force in his FY2015 budget request knowing more work must be done.

Dr. Quarles closed the meeting by announcing that Ms. Linder has recently accepted a position at Idaho State University as the Associate Dean in the College of Education. Her position at the State Department of Education will be filled, but she will remain involved with the tiered licensure work.

The next meeting of the Tiered Licensure Technical Advisory Committee is December 13, 2013, beginning at 9:00 am/MT.

The committee adjourned at 3:53 pm.